

REMARKS

The present Amendment amends claims 1, 5 and 6, leaves claims 2-4 unchanged and adds new claims 7-9. Therefore, the present application has pending claims 1-9.

The disclosure stands objected to due to informalities noted by the Examiner in paragraph 1 of the Office Action. Amendments were made to the specification to correct the informalities noted by the Examiner. Therefore, Applicants submit that this objection is overcome and should be withdrawn.

Applicants acknowledge the Examiner's indication in paragraph 4 of the Office Action that claims 1-5 are allowed over the prior art of record.

Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Schuchman (U.S. Patent No. 6,169,484) in view of Halliday (U.S. Patent No. 6,720,881). This rejection is traversed for the following reasons. Applicants submit that the features of the present invention as now recited in claim 6 are not taught or suggested by Schuchman or Halliday whether taken individually or in combination with each other as suggested by the Examiner. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

Amendments were made to claim 6 so as to clarify that the present invention is directed to an information provision system including a first portable terminal, a second portable terminal that moves together with a moving body, information provision equipment and a server.

According to the present invention, the first portable terminal and the second portable terminal each transmits moving speed information of the terminal to the

information provision equipment and the information provision equipment notifies the server with the moving speed information that the first portable terminal is near the information provision equipment when the first portable terminal is near the information provision equipment. Also, according to the present invention, the server uses the moving speed information, the current position of the information provision equipment and information on danger affecting the current position to notify the second portable terminal that the first portable terminal is in a region of danger.

The above described features of the present invention are discussed, for example, on page 6, line 3 through page 7, line 5 of the present application. The Examiner's attention is directed to this portion of the specification.

The above described features of the present invention now more clearly recited in claim 6 are not taught or suggested by Schuchman or Halliday whether taken individually or in combination with each other as suggested by the Examiner.

Schuchman discloses a personal location system having a server center from which movement to inform a prescribed local area and a prescribed wide area are to be monitored. As taught by Schuchman the system monitors the in-and-out movement of a mobile phone within a covered area of a base station so as to report such movement to a server.

Thus, as is quite clear from the above, there is no teaching or suggestion in Schuchman of the above described features of the present invention now more clearly recited in the claims. Particularly, there is no teaching or suggestion in Schuchman that the first portable terminal and the second portable terminal each

transmits moving speed information of the terminal to the information provision equipment as recited in the claims.

Further, there is no teaching or suggestion in Schuchman that the information provision equipment notifies the server with the moving speed information that the first portable terminal is near the information provision equipment when the first portable terminal is near the information provision equipment as recited in the claims.

Still further, there is no teaching or suggestion in Schuchman that the server uses the moving speed information, the current position of the information provision equipment and information on danger affecting the current position to notify the second portable terminal that the first portable terminal is in a region of danger as recited in the claims.

The above noted deficiencies of Schuchman are not supplied by Halliday. Therefore, combining the teachings of Schuchman with Halliday still fails to teach or suggest the features of the present invention as recited in claim 6.

In the Office Action the Examiner recognizes the deficiencies of Schuchman and attempts to combine Schuchman with Halliday for an alleged teaching in Halliday that an information provision system upon, sensing the first portable terminal approaching the information provision signal, sends a signal to a server which in turn notifies the second portable that the first portable terminal is in a region of danger. However, at no point in Halliday is there any clear teaching of such a feature in order support the allegations made by the Examiner.

Further, there is no teaching or suggestion in Halliday of the above described features of the present invention also shown above not to be taught or suggested by

Schuchman. Particularly, Halliday fails to teach or suggest that the first portable terminal and the second portable terminal each transmits moving speed information of the terminal to the information provision equipment as recited in the claims.

Further, there is no teaching or suggestion in Halliday that the information provision equipment notifies the server with the moving speed information that the first portable terminal is near the information provision equipment when the first portable terminal is near the information provision equipment as recited in the claims.

Still further, there is no teaching or suggestion in Halliday that the server uses the moving speed information, the current position of the information provision equipment and information on danger affecting the current position to notify the second portable terminal that the first portable is in a region of danger as recited in the claims.

Thus, it is quite clear from the above that Halliday suffers from the same deficiencies relative to the features of the present invention as recited in claim 6 as Schuchman. Accordingly, combining the teachings of Schuchman and Halliday in the manner suggested by the Examiner in the Office Action still fails to teach or suggest the features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in the claims. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claim 6 as being unpatentable over Schuchman in view of Halliday is respectfully requested.

As indicated above, the present Amendment adds new claims 7-9. New claims 7-9 recite many of the same features shown above not to be taught or suggested by Schuchman and Halliday whether taken individually or in combination

with each other as suggested by the Examiner. Therefore, new claims 7-9 are allowable over the prior art of record.


The remaining references of record have been studied. Applicants submit that they do not supply any of the deficiencies noted above with respect to the references utilized in the rejection of claim 6.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, applicants submit that claims 1-9 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of claims 1-9 is respectfully requested.

To the extent necessary, the applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment of fees, to the deposit account of MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C., Deposit Account No. 50-1417 (500.42934X00).

Respectfully submitted,

MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C.



Carl I. Brundidge
Registration No. 29,621

CIB/jdc
(703) 684-1120